REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12, and 14-18 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner with Claims 11 and 13 standing canceled.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-18 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-18 of copending application 10/008,039.

Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be held in abeyance until at least one patent application has been patented. Furthermore, the rejection is premature since the claims may change during prosecution, and consequently, such a rejection may not be needed.

Turning now to the art rejections, Claims 1, 3-8, and 11-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Thompson; and Claims 1-2, 7-10, 12, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Tinsley.

The specific claims rejected are estimated since the rejection is unclear.

These rejections are respectively traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Gabara does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including both when the load is a standard LVDS load, the load is driven by a standard LVDS compatible output, and when the load is a standard CML load, the load is driven by a standard CML compatible output as defined in the various forms in independent Claims 1, 12, and 18.

The Examiner alleges that Thompson discloses that drivers are compatible with LVDS or CML. Applicants traverse.

The Thompson reference does not explicitly state the presently claimed compatibility. Therefore an explanation of the Examiner's reasoning is requested.

With respect to Tinsley, Applicants note that this rejection was made under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). This section of the statue requires a disclosure of another.

In this connection, both the patent to Tinsley and the current patent have a common inventor, namely Steven Tinsley. The Examiner's attention is directed to the Affidavit filed on September 12, 2003.

Consequently, the patent to Tinsley is not a patent to another. This rejection is improper.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-18 patentably define over the applied references.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265

W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,478